

1 HONORABLE RICHARD A. JONES  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON  
AT SEATTLE

9 COSTCO WHOLESALE CORPORATION,

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 AU OPTRONICS CORPORATION, et al.,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C13-1207RAJ  
ORDER

14 The court has reviewed the parties' stipulation accepting the court's proposal to  
15 begin trial on September 8, 2014 and conclude it no later than October 24, 2014. The  
16 court directs the clerk to set a September 8, 2014 trial date.  
17

18 The court has also reviewed the stipulated motion in which Plaintiff and  
19 Defendant Chungwha Picture Tubes, Ltd. inform the court that they have reached a  
20 settlement. They ask that the court excuse Chungwha from pretrial participation pending  
21 the completion of its settlement obligations. No party has objected. The court GRANTS  
22 the motion (Dkt. # 422) and orders that Chungwha has no further pretrial obligations  
23 unless the court orders otherwise. The parties shall promptly file a stipulation for  
24 dismissal when Chungwha has completed its settlement obligations. The court notifies  
25 Chungwha and other parties that it will not delay trial in the event that Chungwha and  
Plaintiff are ultimately unable to perfect their settlement.  
26  
27

28 ORDER - 1

1       All parties are on notice that the court is holding open an extraordinary amount of  
2 time for their trial. That decision will severely constrain the court's ability to schedule  
3 other matters for nearly two months. The parties are therefore jointly responsible for  
4 promptly informing the court of any developments that will impact trial or its length.

5       The parties previously requested that the court grant them 30 days following its  
6 order setting a trial date to prepare a joint statement regarding necessary pretrial  
7 proceedings. The court accordingly orders the parties to file a joint status report no later  
8 than November 7, 2014. That report need not address the trial date, but they shall address  
9 a schedule for motions in limine and any other pretrial motions. Given the proceedings in  
10 the MDL court, the court is not inclined to permit pretrial motions other than motions in  
11 limine, but will consider the parties' requests. Any party who wishes to file a motion  
12 other than a motion in limine shall be specific about what motion(s) it intends to bring  
13 and why that motion is necessary. When the parties meet and confer, they must consider  
14 the court's local rules, which impose default deadlines for the submission of jury  
15 instructions, impose restrictions on motions in limine, and otherwise establish pretrial  
16 procedures.

17       DATED this 7th day of October, 2013.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28



The Honorable Richard A. Jones  
United States District Court Judge